DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 984 TM 003 840

AUTHOR Moore, Vivan E.; Senungetuk, Joseph E.
TITLE Statewide Community Participation in Needs Assessment.
PUB DATE [Apr 74]
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (59th, Chicago, Illinois, April 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Communication Problems; *Community Involvement; *Educational Assessment; *Educational Needs; Ethnic Groups; *Intercultural Programs; School Organization; State Programs; State Surveys; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Alaska; Cross Cultural Education Programs

ABSTRACT

The Alaska Educational Program for Intercultural Communication is developing a method of needs assessment which is unique to the state, possibly to the nation. The staff is comprised of highly creative and interculturally sentient people, all uncredentialed in evaluation. Their task has been to develop structures which foster communication where it has not previously occurred, between white school teachers and administrators, and Native parents and board members. As educational needs have been identified, working relationships have been built so that constructive action toward resolution of problems begins with the needs assessment. (Author)

ED 093984

TM 003 840

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

14.13

STATEWIDE COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN NEEDS ASSESSMENT

By Vivan R. Moore

Joseph E. Senungetuk

University of Alaska

To be presented at the Annual Conference of the

American Educational Research Association

Chicago, Illinois

April, 1974

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Alaska's unique position as the largest state geographically, the smallest state demographically, populated by half a dozen major ethnic groups and a dozen smaller language groups, the site of a great political struggle for land rights by Native people, and the center of international controversy over ecology and energy - all of these factors contribute to an environment in which standard methods of seeking information about educational needs are not entirely valid. And for these varieties of reasons, new strategies are continually being devised. In an attempt to inventory and to seek solutions for educational needs of Alaska's Native students, the Center for Northern Educational Research (CNER) at the University of Alaska has developed a method of statewide community participation in needs assessment. This approach to needs assessment is new to the State of Alaska; its structure and staffing patterns are unusual and may be of interest for educational institutions in other states.

Funded under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and entitled "Special Training Institutes on Problems of Desegregation," the project was begun in November of 1972 by a core staff of three people: a well known Eskimo artist and writer with some experience in evaluation of educational programs for Native Americans, through work with the American Indian Historical Society; a Tlingit Indian teacher recently graduated from the University of Alaska with a master's degree in school administration and teaching experience in the Peace Corps; and a white teacher with a master's degree in elementary teaching, also from the University of Alaska, with social work and teaching experience. None of the three was experienced in administrative work but each knew well some important aspect of the educational scene in Alaska--having lived as part of a particular minority culture, having lived within the dominant culture, having studied in the only major Alaskan university system, having worked for improved cross-cultural education programs both in and outside of Alaska.

The general plan was to hold six regional workshops, where school administrators, teachers, students, parents, school board members, and interested community leaders would meet together for three days. Discussion was to focus upon the problems in Native/non-Native relations in the schools, and techniques for resolution of problems. It was the intent of the project to establish needs assessment as the first step in breaking the pattern of inter-ethnic non-communication which was instilled in all Alaskan public education systems. A method was developed which openly solicited contact and communication between the educational establishment, usually dominated by personnel and value orientations of the white American majority, and Native parents, whose voices are rarely heard by the institution but who are the so called recipients of services of the total educational establishment. The project's community participation approach to needs assessment differed from the educational needs assessments previously exercised in that it attempted to build working relationships between school people and community people as needs were identified, rather than simply gathering data and turning them over to policy-makers or record keepers.

The first part of this paper will describe how the workshops were conducted. It must be stressed that techniques were experimental, in the folk sense of the word. Staff members had pre-conceptions of what would work with which groups of participants and what would not. All statements are observations, based on experience of a staff which never attempted, indeed spurned outside efforts, to be scientific.

The second part of the paper is a brief outline of the needs which participants in the six workshops expressed, along with some comments by the authors on the state of cross-cultural education programs in Alaska.

Addenda includes general information on education in Alaska and specific data describing the workshops, all of which may form a background for understanding the rest of the paper.

METHODS

We began by selecting a steering committee, with members from all over the state representing, we hoped, all major ethnic groups and roles in the educational systems of the state. Our first meeting was an informal discussion of possible sites for the six regional workshops. Consideration of the availability of housing and meeting rooms, accessibility during severe weather, suitability of the local social climate, and attitudes of school administrators in various places led to the selection of about 15 towns where communication workshops involving needs assessment might be attempted.

Project directors then set out a schedule of pre-planning tours of the regions, to determine the final location for each workshop and to find an appropriate contact person at each location. On each pre-planning tour one or both of the directors met with school teachers and administrators, officials and members of Native organizations, and university associates in the area to explain the possibilities for needs assessment and to specify the purpose of the proposed workshop - which was to open channels of communication between the people who operate rural Alaskan schools, who are generally white, and the people whose children attend these schools, who are generally Native

The difficulties with transportation and regional politics which we would encounter throughout the project became apparent on the pre-planning tours. On one such tour a possible site was eliminated when the plane could not land there in high winds. On another tour a site was chosen because of the number of political and ethnic factions represented in four separate education systems where the town's population was under 5,000 people.

The contact person found on the pre-planning tour for each workshop was someone who in the estimation of the directors seemed to have a rapport with both the school people and the community people in an area. This

person was usually very dedicated to the ideal of cross-cultural education and volunteered great amounts of time and energy to plan all phases of the workshop.

The most crucial aspect of planning was the selection of participants. To a large extent, selection was the responsibility of the contact person and this person's sensitivities were reflected in the final list of names. At one of the workshops, the contact persons worked in a Native organization which took a strong and influential interest in the bilingual programs of the local school, so participants were generally vocal Natives and non-Natives wanting to discuss bilingual programs. At another workshop the contact persons was a young counselor who invited quite a few students and encouraged them to speak.

Encouraging people who are not usually heard by the power structure to speak up about their needs and urging people in the power structure to listen -- this was the real intent of the workshops. We tried various approaches in organization to achieve the goal of significant two-way communication. Participants' responses were not always consistent from one workshop to the next but we felt that we developed a general framework of organization which yielded some communication between educational establishment people and the rural community people.

Factors to consider for the organizational base developed are (1) the physical surroundings of the meeting areas, (2) the grouping of people, (3) the degree to which the agenda is structured, and (4) the direction which consultants and speakers take.

First and probably least important is the physical environment. We wanted to schedule workshops in "friendly environments", that is, in comfortable, medium-sized rooms, in a community building which neither white nor Native people would see as threatening. There are many assorted and miscellaneous meeting places used by people in Alaskan towns because of a short supply of uniform and typical community halls. We as an outside agency generally could not plan with certainty what physical place to make use of. We did not find that meeting in the schools intimidated Native people or that meeting in the Native organization's hall intimidated most educators. However, this does not speak for white groups other than the educational professions such as town councils, chambers of commerce, etc. These people would not attend a meeting in a place identified as Native. The whole idea of numbers of Native people meeting anywhere to discuss cross-cultural education may have intimidated some school administrators (many did not attend at all), but the actual setting of the meeting inconsequential. Ghetto-ization has not had much chance yet in Alaska since its cities are still relatively young compared to "the Lower Forty-eight".

Grouping of people was much more significant. As a starting point, it is necessary to explain a phenomenon which is common to students of inter-cultural communication in Alaska. This is that when Native people and white people who do not know each other are brought together for discussion, the Native people will begin by keeping quiet and the white people will begin by talking. Needless to say this is a generalization. Another generalization: Native people will speak more quietly while white people will speak more loudly. A final generalization: even if white people are

in a distinct minority (in terms of numbers) at a mixed meeting, they will often do most of the public speaking.

A lot of school teachers and government administrators making the above observations have fallaciously inferred that Native people are "non-verbal". This is, of course, ridiculous. Keeping quiet in a threatening situation is a cultural response not limited to Alaskan Natives, just as talking in a threatening situation is a cultural response.

To encourage more talking by the listerners and more listening by the talkers, various group arrangements were tried. Leadership in these groups was assigned, so that someone was responsible for eliciting everyone's opinions. This is a very difficult role because it may be considered as impolite to "force" someone to speak as not to allow a person an opportunity to speak.

What is the effect of the group leader's ethnic background on members of the group? It is probably of great initial importance. A Native person will probably initially feel more at ease with a Native group leader; likewise the white group member with a white leader. However, the initial feelings can change quite drastically as soon as the group leader speaks. It is our impression that the group leader's manner has an effect equal to the effect of ethnic background, with most people.

Some people feel that they cannot voice their most important thoughts in the presence of people who are different. This feeling was expressed and acted upon twice in the last workshop we held.

At the Anchorage Statewide Workshop on Cross-Cultural Education, participants from the previous five regional workshops gathered, along with new people. The keynote speaker was a well known figure from Wounded Knee who spoke of the injustices perpetrated upon Indian people by traditional American institutions over the centuries. This set a tone which perhaps made it easier for people to express a feeling of wishing to meet in like groups. A Native caucus was called for and a lengthy block of time devoted to it. Next students asked for a student caucus and time was allotted to that group.

Requests for caucuses like these are controversial, especially when the criterion for attending the caucus is racial. Some people, both Native and white, believe in separatism and some do not even if a caucus such as this was asked for because of unity for Native voice, and not just to separate from the total group.

The directors of this project felt that the caucus should be used as a structure to facilitate communication; it should provide a place where people who feel uncomfortable about speaking in the presence of "different" people may make their opinions known. Others in the group can later communicate these opinions to the people outside the caucus. Many times though, the caucus will not be used in this way. Unless skillfully guided the caucus can become a platform for the most vocal members whose stances are already well known, rather than a supportive environment for people who have not previously spoken.

At all of the workshops, we alternated small group discussions with entire group meetings. We began each workshop with an explanation of purposes as we saw them, then devised the formation of small groups some time before the first meal. All the "base" small groups included, as much as possible, school people (white), Native parents, students, and a project staff member or consultant. The consultant led the introductions, then asked people to discuss the question "What are we here for?" Someone would always be there without any idea why he/she had come but most people were ready to investigate together the problems of cross-cultural education. Cross-cultural education in Alaska is extremely problematical and conversation usually became intense rather quickly. It was important to establish groups before the first meal, since we usually asked groups to eat together. We tried to use meal times for their obvious social benefits.

After small groups had met there was always a request for information about what had happened in other groups, so we scheduled a convocation at least once, usually twice, every day.

We tried to utilize several role-playing schemes in the workshops to help participants see other people's concerns from new viewpoints, but these met with limited success. Participants were generally resistant to "playing games." Films were very popular, however.

Scheduling special sessions, caucases, films, and other activities to meet the needs of participants as they are expressed seems on the one hand a necessary step in a workshop whose goal is to facilitate communication between previously uncommunicative groups. On the other hand it wreaks havoc with the structure, or the agenda, which many of the participants are expecting to work with. We discovered no way to please both the people who demanded flexibility and the people who demanded that we "stick to the agenda". One possible solution, the unassigned block of time, did not work out well because most people planned ahead of time to leave during "free time", and complaints of lack of organization were voiced.

We repeatedly attempted to work with a "flexible agenda" concept but we finally had to concede that following the originally prepared agenda quite closely was more satisfactory to most people. So in preparing the set agenda we learned to include presentations by all groups, and factions within groups, often following presentations by panels of reactors. As previously mentioned, small groups proved the most effective vehicle for expression by every participant.

We come to the fourth major consideration in the organization of cross-cultural communication/needs assessment workshop - the direction of speakers, staff members and consultants. This was probably the most important factor in the relative success or failure of a workshop. Project staff attempted to develop a process for solution of some of the region's education problems through two-way communication between the educational community and the students' home community. The fostering of communication channels was difficult, painful, arduous and frustrating for the staff members and consultants and for the participants. It was the task of the participants to speak and listen directly to people they had previously dealt with on an abstract basis,

through memos and rumors and liaison persons. It was the task of staff members and consultants to facilitate this communication, to make it possible and to make it easier. This required a level of sensitivity and skill which was possessed in varying degrees. No one felt thoroughly confident. At the end of each day, everyone felt drained.

We learned through repeated experiences that a positive direction must be set by the consultant leaders. Otherwise discussions could degenerate to gripe sessions from which no constructive action could be expected. To set a positive direction, consultants might speak about:

1. the aspects of a particular minority culture which affect how children learn - what teachers must consider

2. successful cross-cultural programs in other districts in the state - planning and implementation

3. funding sources for cross-cultural education programs - who to talk to

4. studies concerned with cross-cultural education needs - the potentially helpful approaches section

In small group discussions, leaders may ask participants to suggest changes which everyone can make to meet unmet needs. Both the superintendent and the parent are asked how they can change their respective outlooks. They ask each other's opinions of what change is needed, then ask themselves how they can contribute to effecting the change.

Does the superintendent actually listen to parents' opinions and attempt to change the way the school is operated? Do the parents really consider changing attitudes? The answer is a guarded yes. Because of the increasing political voice of Native people in Alaska, backed by federal legislation for equal educational opportunity, the education establishment is being forced to make changes. And because of the grief parents suffer over sending their children away from home for high school, or sending them to local schools dominated by white, Anglo-Saxon values, parents are willing to consider many changes to help their children cope more easily with the education world.

NEEDS

Following are the authors' views on methods to increase input from the people of rural Alaska and thereby to improve educational services:

1. Recognize the unorganized borough (the approximately 200 Native villages of Alaska) as the equivalent of the organized school districts. The present drive of the State Department of Education to recruit villages into the first, second, or third class borough system and/or to reclassify them as first class cities (if the population is over 400) is not a passable

means of recognizing these communities. Up to now villages have been considered a problem area. They need different types of programs in order to rectify past ill treatments by state and federal authorities. The villages should be recognized for their unique ways of looking at themselves and not as objects which everyone hears about in travelogue brochures, who should be fitted into standard governmental systems developed in Europe and the smaller states by the dominant society.

2. Provide a communications link which during precontact periods was a reality for Native people. For example, Northwest Alaskan Eskimos should be able to exchange ideas with people in Northwest Greenland as it used to be before contact with white people. Today it appears to many scholars in universities and other educational institutions dealing with education of Arctic regions that inter-disciplinary and international sharing of resource materials is a must. It should be encouraged at grass-roots levels as well as at administrative levels. The average village in Alaska has to live without the benefits of the services of information exchange available to the researchers - travel requisition forms, per diem, telephones, mail service on a daily basis and enough money to pay a staff who expects the comforts of western civilization.

3. Provide for Native input into policy decisions by the major education agencies, by requiring Native staffing at high levels. Whenever there has been a catastrophic mishandling of state programs, such as the five years it took the State Operated Schools to find out that the regional dormitory system only magnified the intensities of Native student problems in adjustment from village to regional centers, there really has been no one group of advocates for educational equity for the Alaskan Native student. There have been advisory boards, the scattered voices of the Alaska Federation of Natives regional corporations when and if they happened to pull together an educational committee, and sometimes teachers and administrators sympathetic towards their service area. There has not been one recognized power base which can react to the state programs before, during and after the mistakes made by outside powers. Native student advocates would have to be representative of the many systems besides SOS which have input to decisions which affect village schools. They should be able to speak out about degrading and mistaken text books now used in elementary and high schools also.

4. Pool together materials from the many resource libraries in the state for better curriculum development. Assist with programs which attempt to utilize local expertise and local Native resource people in curriculum development. Publicize and detail techniques of good programs for other communities who see the need but don't know how to get started or once started don't know how to work towards an end.

5. Use the Alaska Native newspaper, the Tundra Times, owned and operated by the Eskimo, Indian and Aleut Publishing Company, Fairbanks, Alaska which spreads the word out to the rural Native communities on Native affairs.

On a National level, use the Nassaja of the American Indian Historical Society of San Francisco. In each newspaper and in the many other periodicals which provide current information about education in American Indian and Native areas, there should be a column using very simple language on the legislation involved in each state on Indian education.

6. Seek alternatives to the workshop format for information dissemination. Workshops are so over used now that it is hard to expect follow-through from each one in Alaska. This system at the present time keeps too many conference goers on the air lines of Alaska. There is a satellite communications system which will be tried out for the correction of this trend in how best to render collective insights on what is right for the minorities in Alaska. In the meantime there should be a communications center which can compete with the dollars used in administration and travel fares in order to find out the feelings of village leaders.

7. Investigate changes for the rigid system of certification which steadfastly maintains the status quo for rural education in Alaska. So long as the typical school organization relies on hiring of administrators, researchers, building planners, selectors of instructional materials and other related services through this system of certification, there will be little input from rural village people. Stop the practice of juggling curriculum development between the motivated and concerned agitator for "more relevant curriculum" and the degreed education specialist who sees the need but cannot provide operational funds.

8. Provide a communication link between all the programs funded to improve education all over the state. Presently a plethora of small projects, usually underfunded and under the sponsorship of somewhat paternalistic and politically hindered head offices, have founded a new tradition. They look out for their own programs and distrust most of the others. Distrust of the unknown is an understandable result of a lack of communication.

9. Prevent a non-Native backlash response to "Native" education programs through heavy use of the mass media to explain why there are special programs in health, education and welfare for the culturally uprooted and economically deprived minorities.

10. Refine more grass-roots approaches in developing programs for rural education. Involve rural parents in decision-making, allowing them opportunities to study alternatives and discover their own routes.

No matter what is the most innovative step in today's Alaskan educational delivery system, the status quo doldrums, on top of the socio-economic and political forces adding to the miseries of the Alaskan village will persist, until the state legislature, the individual administrative bodies, the associations of school boards, PTA's and teachers, the entire present decision making group relinquishes its powers and hands them over to the village people.

REGIONAL COMMUNICATION WORKSHOPS - DIVERSITY OF COMMUNITIES

Region	Site	Population[1]	Ethnic Composition[2]	School System[3]	Native Organization[4]
Southeast	Sitka	4,659 (454 at boarding school)	61% white[5] 36% Native (Tlingit Indian in Sitka Indian and Eskimo at Mt. Edgecumbe)	Greater Sitka Borough Schools Mt. Edgecumbe-Bureau of Indian Affairs Boarding School Sheldon Jackson College - 2 years Sitka Community College - University of Alaska	Alaska Native Brotherhood Alaska Native Sisterhood Tlingit-Haida Central Council
Southwest	Bethel	2,726 (310 in dormitory and boarding program)	79% Native (Eskimo) 19% white	Alaska State Operated School System - primary, middle, Bethel Regional High School Bureau of Indian Affairs Agency Office - regional Kuskokwim Community College - University of Alaska	Yupiqtak Pista Bristol Bay Native Corporation
South-Central	Kodiak	3,899 (101 in dormitory and boarding program)	79% white 17% Native (Aleut)	Kodiak Island Borough School District - schools in town and surrounding villages Kodiak Regional Dormitory - Alaska State Department of Education Kodiak Community College	Koniag, Inc. Uyak Natives, Inc.
Interior	Copper Center	296	53% white 45% Native (Athabascan Indian)	Copper Center School (Grades 1-8) Alaska State Operated School System	Ahtna, Inc. Tanana Chiefs Conference
North-West	Nome	2,661 (173 in dormitory)	64% Native (Eskimo) 35% white	Nome City Schools Nome-Beltz Regional Dormitory	Kawerak Bering Straits Native Association

1 Population of the site computed from 1970 census figures, plus number of students attending boarding school, living in dormitory or part of boarding home program, 1972-73 school year.

2 At the site, taken from "Age and Race by Sex Characteristics of Alaska's Village Population," Institute of Social, Economic and Government Research, University of Alaska, Sept., 1973. Students attending boarding schools, living in dormitories or boarding homes included. Ethnic group shown under % Native is predominant, not exclusive of all others.

3 At the site only. Does not include all school systems in the region.

4 As represented by participants from the region.

5 Percentages do not total 100% because Blacks and "Others" are not listed.

THREE SYSTEMS OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATION IN ALASKA

District Schools

Located within cities and boroughs, independent districts are organized along the traditional American lines. A superintendent is responsible to an elected school board and the system is supported with local and state taxes and federal funds. There are 29 independent school districts in the State. About half are located in areas in which the majority of people are white; about half are in areas with a Native majority. All independent school districts have high schools. Some of the independent school districts administer a few rural schools in nearby surrounding villages. See section on advisory school boards.

State-Operated Schools

The Alaska State-Operated School System is responsible for 8,000 students, mostly elementary level, in 125 rural schools in small villages and a few towns all over the State. Most rural students are Alaska Natives. Of the 125 schools, over 30 are one-teacher schools; 37 are two-teacher schools. ASOSS also runs 24 on-base schools for 10,000 children of the military in Alaska. Central offices for the entire State-Operated School System are in Anchorage. Decision-making powers rest with the superintendent and a Board of Directors appointed by the Governor. ASOSS has 16 high schools within its jurisdiction. 11 of these are in White majority towns and five are in Native majority towns. All State-Operated Schools have attached to them local advisory boards. See separate section.

Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools

The BIA operates elementary schools in 50 villages, mostly in Southwest Alaska and one small and one large boarding high school. Students are Alaska Natives. The system's State offices are in Juneau, hiring is through offices in Albuquerque, New Mexico and policy is ultimately set by the Congress and the Department of the Interior in Washington, D.C. Theorectically the Bureau of Indian Affairs will turn over responsibility for operation of any school to the State as soon as the State indicates willingness to assume operating costs and the people of the community request the change. Each Bureau of Indian Affairs school has an advisory board.

Advisory School Boards

There are over 200 small elementary schools located in the villages of Alaska. Almost all of these villages are Native. As previously noted, the schools are run by the Alaska State-Operated School System with central offices in Anchorage, or the Bureau of Indian Affairs with State offices in Juneau. Or they are administered by school systems

based in larger cities and towns within one or two hundred miles (Nome, Kodiak, Fairbanks).

In all these cases, the rural schools have advisory school boards. Parents of children attending a rural school may serve on a board which may make suggestions to the teacher(s) of the school, or to the system's superintendent in the urban center. However, advisory board members have no legal power to decide matters of policy in teacher recruitment, curriculum, testing, or anything else. In general they also have very little influence. Teachers are sent to villages, programs are put into the schools and specialists arrive to "assist" and "evaluate" all without direction from the parents of the students.

Lack of local control of schools embodied in the advisory board concept is a subject of great controvery in Alaska now. Native people in the villages, Native leaders throughout the State and some few educators are demanding local control for rural areas, slowly forcing a change in the administrative structures which have maintained control of rural schools almost exclusively in distant urban centers.

Distances Involved in Administration of Rural Schools

Alaska State-Operated School System

From Anchorage central offices to:

Place	Air Miles	Via
Adak	1195	(milk run)
Allakaket	380	Fairbanks
Bethel	393	direct
Fort Yukon	400	Fairbanks
Metlakatla	800	Juneau
Shungnak	559	Fairbanks, Kotzebue

Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools

From Juneau State offices to:

Place	Air Miles	Via
Barrow	1336	Fairbanks
Barter Island	1211	Fairbanks
Klukwan	100	direct
Kotzebue	1237	Fairbanks
Nightmute	1093	Anchorage
Venetie	1023	Fairbanks, Fort Yukon

The Center for Northern Educational Research

The Center for Northern Educational Research is a relatively young institute at the University of Alaska in Fairbanks. Its purposes are generally to analyze the goals and policies of Alaska's several public education systems in cooperation with concerned local, state and federal agencies and legislative bodies; to promote promising innovations for Alaska's schools, especially in the field of cross-cultural education; and to provide a forum wherein the Native people whose children account for one quarter of the school enrollments in Alaska may meet with members of the educational establishment to develop effective cross-cultural programs.

Programs under CNER's auspices include:

Eskimo Language Workshop -- developing and producing materials in Yupik (Eskimo) for bilingual education programs in over 20 villages; bilingual teacher training.

Alaska Native Languages Center -- studying all of Alaska's 19 Native languages and dialects (except Yupik); training speakers in literacy and linguistics; developing materials for bilingual education projects in selected villages.

Study of the Delivery of Educational Services in the Unorganized Borough -- considering the future of local control for schools in the Alaska State-Operated School System.

Native Heritage Film Project -- producing films about each of five major Native cultures, in cooperation with people in the films.

Allakaket Learning Center -- studying the growth of community participation in educational planning.

Alaska Educational Program for Intercultural Communication -- assisting school districts and other interested groups in developing cross-cultural education programs and awareness.

School Board Training Program -- developing materials and conducting training sessions for rural school board members.

Individual research projects in bilingual education, evaluation, effects of boarding home programs on Alaska's Native students.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY
STATEWIDE WORKSHOP ON INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

Anchorage, Alaska
July 18-20, 1973

We, the participants of the Statewide Workshop on Intercultural Communication, strongly support self-determination and self-development for all Native Americans.

RESOLUTION 1. RESOLVED that a continued, improved, and expanded program for the developmental training of all local school boards (BIA, SOS, and other school district boards) be instituted and that there be an increase in the authority of these school boards.

RESOLUTION 2. RESOLVED that all school districts throughout the State especially BIA and SOS consider the recruiting and placing of Native American educators in school administrative positions to be of the highest priority.

RESOLUTION 3. RESOLVED that until a time that rural students can go to secondary schools in their villages they would much rather live in a group home (the cottage concept) or if necessary in a boarding home with native foster parents. If the boarding home concept is to be an option that students and both foster and natural parents have as much information as possible on each other.

RESOLUTION 4. RESOLVED that the orientation of rural Native youth be more personalized and that the "buddy system" be set up whereby students will assist each other in making the rural-urban transition.

RESOLUTION 5. RESOLVED that if dormitories are to be a living option, students should have input on dormitory policies especially when it comes to choosing a dormitory director.

RESOLUTION 6. RESOLVED that dormitory programs must provide student residents with a variety of extra-curricular activities.

RESOLUTION 7. RESOLVED that this workshop urge the SOS and BIA to update school curriculum and to provide more cross-cultural materials.

RESOLUTION 8. RESOLVED that this workshop expresses deep concern for the youth of Alaska and further urge the Governor, the Legislature, State Department of Education, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs to be more sensitive to the emotional needs of Alaskan Native students.